

## ABBREVIATED PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

This checklist can be used to help the site investigator determine if an Abbreviated Preliminary Assessment is warranted. This checklist should document the rationale for the decision on whether further steps in the site investigation process are required under CERCLA. Use additional sheets, if necessary.

Checklist Preparer: Benjamin D. Bair / Hydrogeologist 11/21/2019  
(Name/Title) (Date)  
2600 Bull St. Columbia, SC 29201 803-898-0775  
(Address) (Phone)  
bairbd@dhec.sc.gov  
(Email Address)

Site Name: Former Sixty Minute Cleaners

Previous Names (if any): [Click here to enter text.](#)

Site Location: 1150 Cherry Rd.  
(Street)  
Rock Hill SC 29732-2506  
(City) (State) (Zip)

Latitude: 34.950911 Longitude: -81.017953

Describe the release (or potential release) and its probable nature:

The Former Sixty Minute Cleaners site began operation in 1963 and used PCE as a solvent until 1997. A site assessment conducted at the facility in 2014 found chlorinated solvent contamination in groundwater, surface water and soils. PCE was present in groundwater at concentrations as high as 68 ppm µg/L. PCE was present in off-site surface water as high as 680 µg/L, and PCE was present in on-site soils as high as 29,300 µg/L.

### Part 1 – Superfund Eligibility Evaluation

If all answers are “No” go on to Part 2, otherwise proceed to Part 3.

Yes No

1. Is the site currently in CERCLIS or an “alias” of another site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Is the site being addressed by some other remedial program (Federal , State or Tribal)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Are the hazardous substances potentially released at the site regulated under a statutory Exclusion (e.g., petroleum, natural gas, natural liquid gas, synthetic gas useable for fuel, normal application of fertilizer, release located in a workplace, naturally occurring, or regulated by the NRC, UMTRCA, or OSHA)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Are the hazardous substances potentially released at the site excluded by policy Considerations ( i.e., deferred to RCRA corrective action)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Is there sufficient documentation to demonstrate that no potential for a release that Could cause adverse environmental or human health impacts exists (e.g., comprehensive remedial investigation equivalent data showing no release above ARARs, completed removal action, documentation showing that no hazardous substance releases have occurred, or an EPA approved risk assessment completed)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Please Explain all “yes” answers: [Click here to enter text.](#)

## Part 2 – Initial Site Evaluation

For Part 2, if information is not available to make a "yes" or "no" response, further investigation may be needed. In these cases, determine whether an APA is appropriate. Exhibit I parallels the questions in Part 2. Use Exhibit I to make decisions in Part 3.

**If any answer is “No” to any of questions 1, 2 or 3, proceed directly to Part 3.**

Yes No

1. Does the site have a release or a potential to release?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Does the site have uncontained sources containing CERCLA eligible substances?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Does the site have documented on-site, adjacent, or nearby targets?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**If the answers to questions 1,2 and 3 above were all “Yes” the answer the questions**

Yes No

**below before proceeding to Part 3.**

4. Does documentation indicate that a target (e.g., drinking water wells, surface water intakes, etc.) has been exposed to a hazardous substance released from the site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Is there an apparent release at the site with no documentation of exposed targets, but there are targets on-site or immediately adjacent to the site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. Is there an apparent release and no documented on-site targets or targets immediately adjacent to the site, but there are nearby targets (e.g., targets within 1 mile)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Is there no indication of a hazardous substance release, and there are uncontained sources containing CERCLA hazardous substances, but there is a potential to release with targets present on-site or in proximity to the site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Notes: [Click here to enter text.](#)

**EXHIBIT 1**  
**SITE ASSESSMENT DECISION GUIDELINES FOR A SITE**

Exhibit 1 identifies different types of site information and provides some possible recommendations for further site assessment activities based on that information. You will use Exhibit 1 in determining the need for further action at the site, based on the answers to the questions in Part 2. Please use your professional judgement when evaluating a site. Your judgement may be different from the general recommendations for a site given below:

Suspected/Documented Site Conditions		APA	Full PA	PA/SI	SI
1. There are no releases or potential to release.		Yes	No	No	No
2. No uncontained sources with CERCLA-eligible substances are present on site.		Yes	No	No	No
3. There are no on-site, adjacent, or nearby targets.		Yes	No	No	No
4. There is documentation indicating that a target (e.g., drinking water wells, drinking surface water intakes, etc.) has been exposed to a hazardous substance released from the site.	Option 1: APA ⇔ SI	Yes	No	No	Yes
	Option 2: PA/SI	No	No	Yes	NA
5. There is an apparent release at the site with no documentation of exposed targets, but there are targets on site or immediately adjacent to the site.	Option 1: APA ⇔ SI	Yes	No	No	Yes
	Option 2: PA/SI	No	No	Yes	NA
6. There is an apparent release and no documented on-site targets and no documented targets immediately adjacent to the site, but there are nearby targets. Nearby targets are those targets that are located within 1 mile of the site and have a relatively high likelihood of exposure to a hazardous substance migration from the site.		No	Yes	No	No
7. There is no indication of a hazardous substance release, and there are uncontained sources containing CERCLA hazardous substances, but there is a potential to release with targets present on site or in proximity to the site.		No	Yes	No	No

**Part 3 - EPA Site Assessment Decision**

When completing Part 3, use Part 2 and Exhibit I to select the appropriate decision. For example, if the answer to question 1 in Part 2 was "no," then an APA may be performed and the "NFRAP" box below should be checked. Additionally, if the answer to question 4 in Part 2 is "yes," then you have two options (as indicated in Exhibit I): Option 1 -- conduct an APA and check the "Lower Priority SI" or "Higher Priority SI" box below; or Option 2 -- proceed with a full PA and then a SI.

Check the box that applies based on the conclusions of the APA:	
<input type="checkbox"/> NFRAP	<input type="checkbox"/> Refer to Removal Program – further assessment needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Higher Priority SI	<input type="checkbox"/> Refer to Removal Program – NFRAP
<input type="checkbox"/> Lower Priority SI	<input type="checkbox"/> Site is being addressed as part of another CERCLA site
<input type="checkbox"/> Defer to RCA Subtitle C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
<input type="checkbox"/> Defer to NRC	
Regional EPA Reviewer: <u>Alan J. Farnham</u>	<u>3/9/2020</u>
Print Name/Signature	Date

Please Explain the Rationale for Your Decision:

The former Sixty Minute Cleaners began operation in 1963 and used PCE as a solvent until 1997. Previous investigations conducted in December 2008 and January 2014 have shown the presence of a chlorinated solvent groundwater plume exceeding applicable MCLs originating at the property and extending offsite towards the north-northwest. The horizontal extent of the groundwater plume has not been fully delineated.

Chlorinated solvent contamination exceeding MCLs has also impacted the surface water pathway in a nearby intermittent stream. The farthest downstream sample collected in a previous field investigation exceeds MCLs. Potential contamination in the surface water pathway needs to be fully delineated.

Soil gas samples collected within the vapor intrusion pathway demonstrated the presence of chlorinated solvent contamination at the nearby Bank of America building. Data collected showed that soil gas values were below applicable Vapor Intrusion Screening Levels (VISLs), but one of the samples collected was inconclusive because it had no vacuum during sample collection. In addition, based on data from the January 2014 field investigation, no soil gas samples were collected in or around the 60 Minute Cleaners building and there are several other structures situated within the footprint of the groundwater plume that may need to be evaluated for potential vapor intrusion contamination as well. The full extent of potential vapor intrusion contamination has not been delineated.

There is contamination associated with the former 60 Minute Cleaners site in on-site soil and groundwater. This contamination extends off-site and is affecting or potentially affecting groundwater, surface water, and vapor intrusion pathways. In addition, the extent of the contamination in these pathways has not been fully delineated. Therefore, the Federal and State Site Assessment Section recommends the site for a Site Investigation (SI).